

936
INDEXED

Brinkerhoff, W.C.

ADVERTISING

IN SPECIAL BRANCHES OF
APR 13 1916

LIBRARY GENERAL'S OFFICE

Medicine and Surgery.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF HEALTH—ITS POSITION.

ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00) DOLLARS.

WHERE IT CAME FROM.

“QUACK” THE CRY OF “REGULARS.”

Regulars would have People believe that Advertising is Evidence of Ignorance and Fraud.

BY

W. C. BRINKERHOFF, M. D.

• Recital Specialist,

80 E. MADISON STREET,

CHICAGO, ILL.

MC VICKER'S THEATRE BUILDING.

GRADUATE CHICAGO COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS.

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1890, by WILLIAM C. BRINKERHOFF, M. D., in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

LIBRARY
LIBRARY GENERAL'S OFFICE
MAR 3 1917

Dr. W. C. Brinkerhoff,

FORMERLY OF OHIO,

RECTAL SPECIALIST.

Rectal Diseases—Piles, Fistula, Fissure, Rectal Ulceration, Polypus, Pruritus (itching piles), and Chronic Diarrhoea cured without use of Knife, Erasure, Cautery or Anaesthetic.

NO DETENTION FROM BUSINESS EXCEPT IN SEVERE CASES.

NO MEDICINES BY STOMACH.

OFFICE:

Rooms 39, 39½, 40 McVicker's Theatre Bldg.
78 TO 82 MADISON ST.

HOURS: { 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. } Except Sunday.
{ 2 to 4 p.m. }
TAKE ELEVATOR.

TELEPHONE 719.

RESIDENCE:

145 OAKWOOD BOULEVARD,

NEAR COTTAGE GROVE AVE. & 39TH ST.

HOURS: { Mon., Wed. & Fri., 7 to 9 p.m.
{ Sundays, 2 to 4 p.m.

TELEPHONE 10087.

ADVERTISING
IN SPECIAL BRANCHES OF
MEDICINE  SURGERY.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF HEALTH—ITS POSITION.

ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00) DOLLARS.

WHERE IT CAME FROM.

“QUACK” THE CRY OF “REGULARS.”

**REGULARS WOULD HAVE PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT
ADVERTISING IS EVIDENCE OF IGNORANCE AND FRAUD.**

BY

**W. C. BRINKERHOFF, M.D.,
RECTAL SPECIALIST,**

80 EAST MADISON STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

McVICKER'S THEATRE BLDG.,

Graduate Chicago College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1890, by WILLIAM C. BRINKERHOFF, M. D.,
in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

CHICAGO, ILL.:
THAYER & JACKSON STATIONERY CO.,
1890

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introductory.....	3
Medical Advertising.....	5
One Reason Why "The State Board of Health will be abolished" (Chicago Tribune).....	6
Agreement to release Illinois State Board of Health from liability for damages on payment of \$1000.....	7
Receipt—Release of State Board of Health from claim for damages.....	7
Affidavit before Probate Court.....	8
Defense before Alumni Association.....	8
Why not Advertise?—Chicago Tribune (Editorial)	11
Defense of Medical Advertising.....	11
More Medical Old Fogeyism—Cleveland (O.) Leader and Herald (Editorial)	12
Unprofessional Conduct—Nebraska State Journal (Editorial).....	12
Why Shouldn't Physicians Advertise?—New Orleans Times Dem. (Editorial)	12
Doctors and Newspapers—Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer (Editorial).....	13
Cleveland (Ohio) Leader and Herald (Editorial).....	13
Toledo (Ohio) Blade (Editorial).....	14
Ashland (Ohio) Gazette (Editorial).....	14
Galion (Ohio) Inquirer (Editorial).....	14
Fruits of Advertising.....	14
A Prescription for them—Chicago Times (Editorial).....	15
Medical Ethics—Toledo (Ohio) Evening Bee.....	15
Register—Rockford Ill	15
Is a physician justified in Advertising.....	15

INTRODUCTORY.

This pamphlet is intended as a defense of Medical Advertising by the Specialist. It is written in hopes that younger and more liberal members of the Profession may adopt its views and use their influence to make the Code of Ethics more liberal. It is not intended as an attack upon College Professors or Regulars as men but upon their position as regards advertising. As men, we respect them, but their views we condemn. It is also hoped that this pamphlet will lead suffering humanity to see that Medical advertising is for their good as well as for the benefit of the advertiser. Advertising informs the sufferer of the Specialty to which the physician gives his undivided attention. The Specialist ought to be more capable of mastering disease in his specialty than the general practitioner who has so vast a field to work in as the general practice of Medicine and Surgery. The writer for years has observed the unjust treatment accorded the Medical men who have ventured to "advertise" in any but a "Regular" way. (The Regular way is to be a Medical College Professor or Contributor to a Medical Journal.) He has seen men of unquestioned ability, men of integrity and unimpeachable moral character, men adapted by nature to the practice of Medicine and Surgery, ostracised by Medical Societies, looked down upon by members of the Regular Profession and branded by the "Regulars" as frauds, impostors and ignoramuses; he has seen the finger of scorn pointed at them, heard them spoken of and to in derision, and all because they ventured to advertise; in other words because they did not care to be bound by a Code of Ethics formulated by Professors of Medical Colleges.

The writer himself has run the gauntlet; he has advertised and suffered the punishment meted out by the Regulars, and in this small pamphlet gives some of the history of the means adopted by men of prominence in the Medical Profession, (members of the Illinois State Board of Health) to prevent him from practicing in Illinois after having fully qualified to do so. He will also endeavor to present the position of his Alumni, and, last but not least, he will present the views of the press. The object is two fold.

First, to show to what extreme the Regular Profession will go to ruin a man who has the independence to break away from their pernicious "Code of Ethics," and, secondly, to place the matter in such light before the people that they will see that advertising does not corrupt, disqualify or make a physician

any less skillful in his chosen Specialty. The day is at hand when the Specialist who advertises commands the respect and confidence of American Citizens, and the Medical Profession will find their opposition of no avail. We will admit that there may be dishonorable men who have adopted advertising and rejected the Code of Ethics, but all callings in life have their black sheep. The Legal Profession, the Regular Medical Profession, and even the Ministry has its faulty members.

The author desires especially the attention of younger members of the Profession, and of the more liberal, to the following pages, and he trusts that public opinion as expressed therein by leading papers of the country (Editorially) will be a stepping-stone to a policy on their part which will lead them to take the "Code of Ethics" from the hands of the College Professor and make it more liberal—more American in its provisions. The Code of Ethics is the College Professor's shield as an advertising monopolist (if members of the Profession do not advertise as he dictates they must not advertise at all. As all cannot be Professors many must remain in obscurity or be black-listed for making themselves known through other Channels.) Destroy the portion of the Code relative to advertising, or make it more liberal, and the "Professors" will become less numerous, as the monopoly will then be broken.

MEDICAL ADVERTISING.

The past century probably has witnessed a greater change in the practice of Medicine than any preceding, both as to remedies and their administration, and the manner of practice.

In years gone by the "family doctor" was THE man of his neighborhood. HE was *the ideal* of knowledge as regards all human ills. Let the body have a pain, an ache, vision become impaired, hearing begin to fail, diseases peculiar to woman kind invade the home, an aching tooth unbalance our fore-fathers, or corns impair their locomotion, and the "family doctor" was immediately called to give relief; he was the panacea for ALL ills. He was supposed to be a veritable Encyclopedia Medica. Rectal troubles were beyond his knowledge, however, only so far as salves might give relief; and to the discredit of the average practitioner of this day salves are the extent of his treatment when a patient suffering with Rectal disease applies for a cure. Suffering humanity began to reason with itself.

One mind, no difference how great, was seen to be inadequate to master Medicine and Surgery in all its branches. A slight knowledge of each branch might be obtained, but to master all was a physical and mental impossibility. Many a hoary-headed M. D. has gone to his grave after a life time of practice realizing that life was too short. He was only commencing to know his business. Mastering the practice of Medicine in all its branches was like unto a camel passing through the eye of a needle. It was impossible. As a consequence of the foregoing facts men in the practice of Medicine realized their inability to successfully cope with Medicine and Surgery as a whole; they realized that there was a life-time study in very small portions of the entirety.

To be successful and masters of their life-work they adopted Specialties; hence we have Oculists, Aurists, Gynecologists, Dentists, Obstetricians, and, in fact, Specialists in all branches.

Then here is the fountain-head of Medical advertising—to acquaint suffering humanity with that Specialty to which we propose to devote our life time is our object. As all cannot be "Medical College Professors" (there is an over production now) and thus gain notoriety, we must naturally seek other channels. As the only other channel (being a contributor to Medical Journals) does not reach those afflicted (only going to the Medical Profession) we are compelled to disregard the Code of Ethics. We are bound in narrow limits. We must choose between two things. Remain true to the Code (and in obscurity the best years of our life) or announce to the public through broad channels the Specialty we

have adopted, and thus through an extensive acquaintance build up a practice in which we give our patients the advantage of a more extensive experience and the best years of our life.

However, there is a stumbling block in the way; the Regular cries Quack, and tries to lead all others to believe it to be true. Why? Because we advertise, but do not advertise in his way i. e. through a Professorship. If we advertise (irregularly) we are dubbed a quack. An inexperienced man in Medicine or Surgery IS DOUBTLESS A QUACK. Webster says *a quack is an ignorant practitioner*. We hence have our choice. We can be an inexperienced Regular with small practice, and the sitting part of our clothing worn through, and Heaven only knowing what next we'll do, or we can by advertising build up a large, lucrative practice; be experienced, successful and independent (but irregular). Thank you, gentlemen of the Profession, we choose the latter. We prefer it to inexperience, servility to old fogy ideas, and a life time spent in mere hand to mouth existence. Having outlined our position relative to advertising we present the following pages for your perusal. They will show that the Illinois State Board of Health has recognized, in a very substantial manner, the right of physicians to advertise. The Supreme Court of Illinois having also set its seal of approval upon said right we feel that we are on solid ground and present herewith solid arguments (Newspaper Editorials) that have come through prominent channels.

To present clearly the unbroken chain of the "Regulars'" opposition to Medical advertising we are compelled to give some portions of the writer's experience.

In the latter part of 1888 the writer was summoned from Ohio to treat a prominent citizen of Chicago. Through the influence of this gentleman, and Mr. A. M. Billings, President of the Home National Bank, we determined to build up a practice in Chicago; but being very busily engaged in Ohio we could not spend but three days in Chicago, every four weeks, which we did, stopping at the Grand Pacific Hotel. After visiting the city regularly for a short time, we were so well pleased with an increasing practice that we permanently located here in 1889. December 28th, 1888, we applied to Dr. J. H. Rauch, Secretary of the ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF HEALTH for a license to practice within the state, at the same time giving him to understand that we intended to follow a Specialty and would advertise. He refused to grant the license at the time, but subsequently did so; not, however, until he saw that his arbitrary way of conducting the office (without sanction of law) was working injury to himself and might result disastrously to the Board, as the following taken from the *Chicago Tribune*, April 15th, 1889, would indicate. We might mention that there had been a bill introduced in the legislature to abolish the "State Board of Health.

ONE REASON WHY THE STATE BOARD OF HEALTH WILL BE ABOLISHED.
Chicago, March 18.

Editor of the Tribune.—I hand you to-day copies of Ohio papers containing editorials on medical legislation, and would ask your considerate perusal of them, and in connection therewith consider the action of the Illinois State Board of Health in the following matter:

The 28th day of December last I made application to Dr. J. H. Rauch, Secretary of the State Board of Health, for a license to practice medicine in the State of Illinois. To secure said license I presented the following credentials:

1. A diploma of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Chicago, issued the spring of 1886, bearing signatures of all the professors of said college, and its seal.

2. A sworn statement by myself that I had come into rightful possession of said diploma by complying with the requirements of the college.

3. Three letters of indorsement from three of the prominent regular physicians of the city, among them one from Dr. D. A. K. Steele, Secretary of the Faculty of the College, the other two letters from ex-professors of the same school (law, however, requiring but one letter.)

4. A sworn statement from a prominent physician of my former place of residence (Upper Sandusky, Ohio,) indorsed by five other physicians, and their indorsements certified to by D. D. Clayton, Probate Judge, Wyandotte County, Ohio, as to my qualifications and standing as a physician and specialist, standing in the community, and moral character.

5. I paid to the Secretary of the Illinois State Board of Health the fee required by law (\$5, a receipt for which I hold) for the granting of said license.

I have made several requests for the license to be granted, and now at the end of nearly three months, I am refused, and that simply because I advertise or desire to do so. My credentials are all admitted (by the board) to be above question, and yet after the decision of the Appellate Court that a physician is at perfect liberty to advertise, I am refused the necessary license to practice within the State because of my intention to advertise, and no other reason is urged by the board. Is this action upon the part of the Secretary of the State Board, and the Board itself not worthy of your editorial consideration.

In addition to the above credentials, I have been indorsed by one of Chicago's most prominent citizens—A. M. Billings, President of the Home National Bank—as being worthy in every way of the license, and he, as a friend has asked that said license be granted, and it has been refused.

Trusting you will give this the consideration that you may think justice demands, I am respectfully yours,

PHYSICIAN.

The above article (written by the author and signed "Physician") appeared Monday morning, April 15th. The same evening the following agreement was entered into. (The Board, or its friends, realized that something must be done.)

Chicago, April 15, 1889.

In consideration of \$150 to me paid, and in consideration of \$850 to be paid on or before April 27, 1889, I hereby agree to release all parties for any damages, losses, or expenses I may have incurred by reason of the refusal of the State Board of Health to grant me a certificate to this date, and that certificate be issued to me promptly and unconditionally within twenty-four hours from this date.

Signed,

"Agreed to: F. W. RILEY.

W. C. BRINKERHOFF.

"Witness: P. R. WESTFALL."

In connection with this agreement I herewith append a receipt given by myself, April 27, as follows:

CHICAGO, April 27, 1889.—In consideration of the sum of \$1,000 to me paid, and the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, I hereby release all parties connected with the State Board of Health from any claim for damages, losses, and expenses, suffered or incurred by me, directly or indirectly, through the refusal of the Illinois State Board of Health to issue its certificate, entitling me to practice medicine or surgery in the State of Illinois prior to April 16, 1889, on which day said certificate was issued to me with the understanding that at no future time shall I be interfered with in my practice by the Board because of advertising. W. C. BRINKERHOFF.

To show more conclusively that advertising was the only ground upon which the Board refused to grant a certificate, I append the affidavit (of my former associate physicians) which was forwarded to the Board while my application was pending:

UPPER SANDUSKY, OHIO, Dec. 28th, 1888.

To whom it may concern: Since his childhood I have known Dr. W. C. Brinkerhoff, who is a native of our town. For two years he was under my instruction in High School, graduating honorably. I have known him through his student life, and can testify that he was a close student; always temperate, honorable and industrious—morally commanding the respect of our entire community, and professionally bears a reputation for success in his specialty (Rectal Diseases) beyond any question whatever, and commands the respect of our Medical Fraternity. I can recommend him to any individual professionally, or to any State Board of Health as worthy their commendation in every way. In his advertising he makes no claims which are untrue, and is competent to fulfill his promises.

G. O. MASKEY, M.D.

[Subscribed in my presence, and sworn to before me this 28th day of December A.D. 1888.

D. D. CLAYTON, Probate Judge, W. C. O.]

UPPER SANDUSKY, OHIO, Dec. 28, '88.—We, Physicians and Surgeons, heartily endorse the contents of the foregoing affidavit by Dr. G. O. Maskey.

A. BILLHARDT, M.D.,

R. N. McCONNELL, M.D. O. C. STUTZ, M.D., former Ass't Surg. 37th Regt. O.V. I.
I. N. BOWMAN, M.D. Health Officer. G. W. SAMPSON, M.D.

[THE STATE OF OHIO, WYANDOTTE COUNTY, ss: I, D. D. Clayton, the Judge of the Probate Court of said county, do hereby certify that the foregoing signatures are genuine, and that the parties are of our most reputable citizens and physicians. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the said Court, this 28th day of December A.D. 1888.

D. D. CLAYTON, Probate Judge, W. C. O.]

Having thus defeated the Illinois State Board of Health in its attempt to deprive us of our rights as a graduate from a Regular Medical College (and as an American Citizen), and having settled with them on what we considered very reasonable terms, we felt that we would have no further trouble, and proceeded in our practice; but the Alumni Association, of which we were a member, felt that it must set its seal of disapproval upon "advertising," and accordingly expelled us. The Secretary, Dr. T. A. Davis, (during the early part of 1890) conveyed the intelligence by letter that we were expelled from the association for "ADVERTISING." No other charges were preferred or considered. Not being of the disposition to submit to indignities being heaped upon us (and not accorded even a word in our own defense) we immediately applied for a hearing before the association, and to the credit of its gentlemanly Secretary, we were granted the privilege of appearing before the association to defend our position. The arbitrary position of the regular school, as regards "advertising," is only too well defined in the Association's refusal to reinstate us. We had advertised, and hence were not good enough for their company. The defense made before the Association appears herewith in full.

THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS, CHICAGO:
Gentlemen.—During the winters of 1884-85, 1885-86, I spent my time in the lecture rooms, dissecting rooms and laboratory of this building and listened to the same lectures and to the same professors as the graduates of '86. I paid the same fees, complied with the same requirements, and passed the same examinations that you have. As a result of my labor I hold a diploma granted by this College on the 25th day of February, 1886. The diploma bears the signatures of all men who were then connected with the school.

Being a graduate from this College I naturally became a member of this Alumni Association. Notice was sent me some time since, by your worthy Secretary, Dr. T. A. Davis, that I was expelled because of "irregular practice," (advertising). I requested a hearing before your honorable body, and as a result of such request I appear before you to-day, not as a member in good standing, but an outcast, and, why? Simply because I advertise. I make no pretension to deny the charge. I do not appear for personal gain or for re-instatement merely, but to champion the cause of legitimate advertising by a specialist. By legitimate advertising I mean the ability of the advertiser to do what he claims.

If the Alumni has based its foundation upon law and justice you cannot help but reinstate me, and to look upon legitimate advertising as perfectly honorable in the practice of a specialty.

In a letter which recently fell into my hands, written to a patient of mine, by a prominent practitioner of Massachusetts, appears the following sentence: "You will find every advertised system a humbug, designed to get your money, whether you get benefit or not."

Now, gentlemen, see the injustice of this statement. As well might we brand a prominent business firm of this city, who advertises, a fraud and calculated to rob us of our money, as to brand a specialist, who advertises, as such. We all advertise.

There is not one of you who has left this College and entered practice but has issued his card, with his office location thereon, and placed his card where he thought it would do the most good.

With the same justice might we declare the college, from which we graduated, a fraud, as do the regular physicians declare the specialist, who advertises, a fraud. The announcement of our college is gotten up for the purpose of advertising the college; it does not advertise the Rush Medical, Chicago Medical, or the Homeopathic Medical College, but it advertises the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Chicago.

Gentlemen, each and every one of you as medical men, were conceived in printer's ink, else how would you have known to have taken your course of lectures at the College of Physicians and Surgeons? Did you not get the announcement, and notice therein the curriculum, and the class of men who are the professors; did not the course of study, and the general plan of the school, as advertised in that announcement, bring you here?

For my part, I perused the announcement carefully before I determined to take my course at the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

I judged its advantages by the prominence of the members of the Faculty; by its excellent course of study; by its proximity to the largest hospital in the city; by its excellent clinical advantages, both surgical and medical, and by the advantages which the fine building would indicate it possessed—all of which I found in its announcement.

I contend that we are all advertisers; the difference between you as members in good standing of the Alumni Association, and myself, as an expelled member, is simply the degree of advertising and the amount which we see fit to employ in our various practices.

The specialist who advertises to such an extent as I do is very quickly placed among the list of quacks. And now let us investigate the injustice of this charge. In the first place, we will refer to Webster's definition of the two words. Webster in his *Unbridged Dictionary* defines advertise as: "To inform, to give notice, or to publish a written or printed account of." If this is the sole and only cause of the charge against me I plead guilty. I not only plead guilty, but am proud of my position as a champion of legitimate advertising, by the specialist; but let us turn to the definition of quack, as laid down by Webster. As applied to medical men, the definition is: "A boastful pretender of medical skill which he does not possess; an imposter; an ignorant practitioner."

I do not in a boastful way say that I am above or beyond anybody else in treatment of disease, but I do say this, and without hesitation, that I can do, and do successfully, that which I claim in my advertisements. If you pronounce this quackery, then you, as medical men, do not accept the definition of Webster for the word.

In my advertisements I claim that 300,000 treatments have been performed by the Brinkerhoff System of Recal Treatment. This is the only statement in my advertisements which has been questioned, and I stand prepared at any time to substantiate the claim by sworn affidavits.

We have sold instruments to 600 physicians in the United States, and here with I give you an affidavit from only one, showing you the number of treatments performed by him:

"THE STATE OF OHIO, HAMILTON Co., ss: Before me, Deputy Clerk U. S. District Court, S. D. O., personally came W. I. Kelly, M. D., who, being duly sworn according to law, deposeth and saith that on or about the 1st day of August, 1889, he purchased of Dr. A. W. Brinkerhoff & Sons of Upper Sandusky, Ohio, a complete outfit, instruments, etc., necessary to practice the treatment of Rectal Diseases by the Brinkerhoff System of Treatment. Since which time he has performed, by said system, Nine Thousand Treatments with not a single death resulting from treatment, and he heartily recommends it to his brother M. D.s, as being the most humane and rational mode of Rectal Treatment known. And, further, deponent saith not.

(Signed)

W. I. KELLY, M. D.,

City of Cincinnati, County of Hamilton, State of Ohio."

"Sworn to and subscribed before me, at the county aforesaid, this 4th day of February, 1889. ROB'T C. GURGI, Dep. Clk. U. S. Dist. Court S. D. O.

The following gentlemen, who are using our treatment, make affidavit to the number of treatments performed by them, as follows: James Cress, M. D., Upper Sandusky, O., 3,935; E. P. Miller, M. D., New York, 9,000; John S. Bare, M. D., East Saginaw, Mich., 10,000; N. R. Hook, M. D., Lincoln, Neb., 2,638; P. W. Einems, M. D., Syracuse, N. Y., 4,975; H. S. Kiskadden, M. D., Detroit, Mich., 5,312; H. W. Hamilton, M. D., Springfield, Mass., 6,097; Johnson Dodge, M. D., Pittsburg, Pa., 2,365; A. B. Jamison, M. D., New York City, 10,000; W. J. Kelly, M. D., Cincinnati, O., 9,000; total, 62,722 treatments by 10 of the 600 physicians using the system.

The statement that 300,000 treatments had been performed by the Brinkerhoff System was questioned by the Secretary of the Illinois State Board of Health. And now a few words as to my recognition by that Board: When I first applied for a certificate to practice in this State, the same was refused me, and that simply and wholly upon the ground of advertising. My application was made in December, 1888; the Secretary of the Board (and I believe the Board itself) saw fit to refuse me. I then took steps to compel a recognition by the Board. The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois decided (in the early part of 1889) that the Board had no right to revoke a certificate because of legitimate advertising. In this decision they recognize and make advertising by a physician legal in every sense of the word.

On the 16th of April, the State Board of Health saw fit to grant me a certificate, and that with the distinct understanding on their part that I should and would advertise; in fact, I refused a certificate on any other grounds.

Further than this, I will now read you an agreement which was entered into before my certificate was granted. This agreement has been fully complied with, but there are verbal agreements (made at the same time) which have not yet been fulfilled—what they are I am not at liberty to inform you at present. [See agreement to pay \$1,000, page 7.]

In connection with this agreement I herewith read you a receipt given by myself on the 27th day of April, as follows: [See Receipt given April 27, page 7.]

Gentlemen, I have been granted a certificate by the State Board of Health—I have been fully recognized by them as an honorable practitioner, and I have my serious doubts whether any of you have received one thousand dollars (\$1,000) from the Board, or any of its members, at the time you received your certificate. Advertising pays!

After the foregoing facts, can you afford, or dare you, in the face of justice and law (the Supreme Court having decided that advertising is legal), expel one of your members in the face of these decisions, or are you so arbitrary in your dealings with members that there is no reason whatever in your decisions?

Washington said: "Arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty abused to licentiousness." No credit is due the Association, surely, if it is founded on the abuse of liberty.

I am aware that the constitution of our Alumni, based upon the code of ethics, prohibits advertising; it not only prohibits advertising, but goes further and prohibits the announcement that the worthy poor shall be treated free. The day has come when such clauses in the constitution of any alumni or medical society should be a thing of the past.

* * * * *

That the interest in the alumni meeting was not confined to members of the Association alone was fully demonstrated by the fact that the *Chicago Tribune*, *Times*, *Lake Ocean* and *Herald* each sent reporters to the meeting, and the following morning reported the proceedings in articles varying from a half column to two columns in length. This was followed by editorial in *Chicago Tribune*, and subsequently was taken up generally by papers outside of Chicago. The editorials as they appeared in various papers are printed in full and are clear and concise.

FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE, March 27, 1890, [Editorial]: *Why not Advertise?*—As a general rule no newspaper favors the cause of the man who advertises, if his advertisement does not offend taste and public propriety, and from this point of view alone THE TRIBUNE is deserved to defend Dr. Brinkerhoff, a young practitioner, who has been dropped by the College of Physicians and Surgeons because he has advertised his special line of practice in the public papers. But, apart from this, why should the profession longer retain this old and absurd custom of not allowing its members to advertise? In the case of Dr. Brinkerhoff, for instance, the *Times* has been informed by one of the most prominent citizens of Chicago that he has been completely cured of a most painful disease which other physicians had been unable to remove by the doctor; that he was induced to apply to him by reading his advertisement. Probably others can give the same testimony. Why, then, should a physician who has made a special study of some form of disease and finds a special remedy for it, or has special skill in treating it, be debarred from announcing that fact in a modest advertisement? Why should he be prevented from making the fact public? One can readily understand why self flattery and brazen puffery should be debarred, for that is the trick of quacks, but puffery is one thing and a simple announcement of the specialty which the physician feels qualified to treat is another. The purpose of an advertisement is to bring those who want something in contact with those who have something to dispose of. The physician's advertisement would answer the same purpose. The patient wants to be healed. The advertisement would acquaint him with the doctor who could heal him and who had the skill to deal with his special case. This is not puffery or quackery. On the other hand, it looks very much like humanity.

In *Chicago Tribune* of April 8th, appeared an article further defending Medical Advertising as follows:

CHICAGO, April 7. [Editor Tribune]: *Defense of Medical Advertising.*—The recent action of the Alumni Association College Physicians and Surgeons of this city in expelling me from their association because of "advertising" has placed me in a position where I must defend myself or else quietly submit to the unjust accusations of a regular profession. Their action has compelled me to take a stand which from the earliest days of my medical schooling has seemed just one, i.e., that "nothing advertising by the specialist is honorable and should not only be looked upon in that light by the public but should receive the sanction of the regular profession, and to that end their musty code of ethics should be changed and the clause prohibiting advertising be abolished."

That portion of the ethics relating to advertising is a relic of the days when water was refused a feverish patient and the lancet and bleeding were the only hope (in the eyes of the profession) of saving their patients from a speedy death. To-day, were a physician to advocate these old theories he would be denounced, and justly so. However, the time is within the recollection of this writer on what level and water, according to the regular profession, we are among onists: the lancet and doctor fast friends. The profession, be it said to their credit, have abolished the above ideas, but still cling to their ancient idea that "to advertise is dishonorable, unprofessional," as a just excuse for the disbarment of the advertiser from any of the privileges accorded the dignified unadvertising "regular."

It devolves upon the young men of the profession to renovate the code. Have the young practitioners not had the wool pulled over their eyes long enough? Is the time not at hand when they should look on their surroundings with eyes of their own and judge what is best with minds of their own? They get their ideas from the professors of medical colleges; not to "advertise" is lectured to them from the time they enter college until they leave. I cannot better illustrate the relation of professor and student than by the reply of a selfish child to a playmate when asked to share his sweetsmeats: "No, it will make you sick," at the same time calmly continuing to devour them himself. The professor tells the students "they must not advertise. It will make them disreputable, irregular, and quacks." Have they ever stopped to think while the professor stands before them and thus warns them of the evils of advertising that it is his desire to advertise himself, that brings him before them as a teacher? He has a good thing: he is advertising himself, and at the same time the college is circulating printed matter bearing his name, his special lecturing and practicing branches, office address, etc.

The medical college of the day is nothing but an "advertising trust," from which the young practitioner is debarred from entering until he has saved up enough money to buy some stock and thus secure a professorship. This done, he is on the inside. He is a member of the trust.

Do you suppose for a moment that the stock of any medical college pays sufficient dividends to remunerate a busy physician for spending his time lecturing? To the contrary. I will venture the assertion that there are very few medical schools that pay their running expenses and interest on the amount of money invested in buildings, etc. If his stock pays no dividends, why, then, is he there?

I do not condemn a professor for advertising. On the contrary it is commendable, but they deserve the condemnation of every sensible practitioner of medicine, young or old, for posing as non-advertising saints when they are really the greatest advertising sinners the profession has in its ranks.

W. C. BRINKERHOFF, M. D.

CLEVELAND (Ohio) LEADER AND HERALD, April 6, 1890, [Editorial]: *More Medical Old Foggism*. A regular practicing physician of Chicago, Dr. Brinkerhoff, has violated that absurd section of the medical code of ethics which prevents a doctor from advertising his business, and has been dropped from the College of Physicians and Surgeons as a punishment. The *Chicago Tribune* has this to say of the matter:—See *Chicago Tribune* (Editorial), page 11.]

The *Tribune* might have said that this wonderful code of ethics was framed not so much to prevent physicians from advertising as to prevent their paying for advertisements. No physician will object to columns of advertising so long as it does not cost him anything; and nothing pleases the average practitioner more than a long and fulsome free puff in connection with an important case in surgery or medicine. There is another thing: The physicians who advertise are usually young and progressive men that have had exceptional advantages to study the treatment of special diseases. The old-school physicians are jealous of the success of these men, and the fact that they advertise their profession, and pay for the advertisements, is made an excuse for putting their names on the medical black list, and tabooing them as quacks. When the young and talented specialists (who are also regular practitioners) shall have succeeded in driving the old fogies to the wall, then this ridiculous code of ethics may be smashed, and the physicians and their patients will be better for it.

NEBRASKA STATE JOURNAL, [Editorial]: *Unprofessional Conduct*.—Dr. Brinkerhoff of Chicago has long been persecuted by the medical society of the State because he advertises. He went into the courts and procured an injunction against the attempt of the society to turn him out for advertising, the court doubtless holding it against public policy to permit this sort of stigma to be put upon an American citizen for exercising his rights. Now, the college of physicians and surgeons have taken up the case of the doctor and has struck his name from the list of alumni. This petty persecution has attracted the attention of the press, and Brinkerhoff is getting some first class advertising as a most successful practitioner in his specialty that will be calculated to make the college sick. There is no reason why a doctor should not be allowed to advertise as much as a lawyer, a clergyman or a teacher. A man has the natural right to let people know that he is around and that he wants business and to tell them what he thinks he can do. The law against advertising was doubtless the device of the old practitioners in the profession, who didn't like the young fellows to bring themselves before the public and thus take some of the bread out of their mouths. The young man must starve in silence or wait for some accident to advertise him, some happy cure that he performed in a wealthy family when the old man was out and could not be found in an emergency. Many of them vegetate their whole lives, their names and professions not being known to their next-door neighbors, and all because they are prohibited from letting the world know who they are and what they want to do. It is against the spirit of the nineteenth century to hedge the young and aspiring man about with these prohibitions. It is an accepted article of faith that "he that bloweth not his own horn, the same shall not be blown." The verdant physician is told at the threshold of his career that it is "unprofessional" to advertise, and he, in his greenness, thinks there is something excessively weighty and solemn about the word "unprofessional." But if he finds it is thoroughly professional to starve because no one has been told that he wants a job, and he dare not say he does, the time will come when he will weary of his etiquette, and if he has the requisite nerve he will make just the sort of kick for life, liberty and the pursuit of business that Dr. Brinkerhoff makes in Chicago.

NEW ORLEANS TIMES DEMOCRAT, May 4th, 1890, [Editorial]: *Why Shouldn't Physicians Advertise?*—A good deal of excitement and some strong feeling have been created North by the action of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in Chicago, in dropping from its roll of members a specialist physician in good standing because he was guilty of the atrocious crime of advertising in the newspapers. The physician in question (W. C. Brinkerhoff, M. D.) is a young man who appears to have made in that particular branch of medicine to which he has devoted special attention, a scientific discovery, whose virtues many prominent citizens of Chicago and elsewhere have attested from their personal experience of it. It was Dr. Brinkerhoff's new fangled method of apprising the world through the press in paid advertisements of the treatment he adopts in curing certain classes of ailments that brought down the proverbial "odium medicorum" upon him and led to the erasure of his name from the college rolls. It would be difficult to say why a rule prohibiting a physician from announcing his specialty, if he has one, in a modest and decent advertisement in a paper circulating widely among the people, should ever have crept into the code of medical ethics; and still more difficult to devise

a reason why the rule, which did find its way into the code, should not have disappeared before now in the light of modern progress. "One can readily understand," as the *Chicago Tribune* says, "why self-laudation and brazen puffery should be debarred for that is the trick of quacks; but puffery is one thing, and a simple announcement of the specialty which the physician feels qualified to treat is another." The purpose of an advertisement is to bring those who want something in contact with those who have that something to dispose of. The physician's advertisement should answer the same purpose. The patient wants to be healed. The advertisement would acquaint him with the doctor who could heal him and who has the skill to deal with his special case. This is not puffery or quackery; on the other hand it looks very much like humanity." There is no small amount of relevance in the charge brought by Dr. Brinkerhoff himself in this matter against the professional staff of medical colleges, who support the many code for their own special aggrandizement. He says: "It devotes upon the young men of the profession to renovate the code. Have the young practitioners not had the wool pulled over their eyes long enough? Is the time not at hand when they should look on their surroundings with eyes of their own and judge what is best with minds of their own? They get their ideas from the professors of medical colleges. Not to 'advertise' is lectured to them from the time they enter college until they leave. I cannot better illustrate the relation of professor and student than by the reply—a selfish child to a playmate when asked to share his sweetmeats: 'No, it will make you sick.' At the same time calmly continuing to devour them himself. The professor tells the students 'they must not advertise. It will make them disreputable, irregular and quacks.' Have they ever stopped to think while the professor stands before them, and thus warns them of the evil of advertising, that it is his desire to advertise himself that brings him before them as a teacher? He has a good thing; he is advertising himself and at the same time the college is circulating printed matter bearing his name, his special lecturing and practicing specialties, office address, etc. The medical college of the day is nothing but an 'advertising trust,' from which the young practitioner is debarred from entering until he has saved up enough money to buy some stock and thus secure a professorship. 'Tis done, he is on the inside. He is a member of the trust. Do you suppose for a moment that the stock of any medical college pays sufficient dividends to remunerate a busy physician for spending his time lecturing? To the contrary, I will venture the assertion that there are very few medical schools that pay their running expenses and interest on the amount of money invested in buildings, etc. If its stock pays no dividends, why, then, is he there? I do not condemn a professor for advertising. On the contrary, it is commendable, but they deserve the condemnation of every sensible practitioner of medicine, young or old, for posing as non-advertising saints when they are really the greatest advertising sinners the profession has in its ranks." Finally, when physicians show an indisposition to have their names blazoned in the papers in connection with any great surgical operation, in which they may be engaged, or in any professional movement in which they happen to be leaders or prominent actors, and when they cease to be solicitous about having their occasional departures from the scene of their practice, and their return home again carefully chronicled in the columns of newspapers merely for the advantage and convenience of their patients, of course, then will the public believe that their anti-advertising rule is neither a sham nor an expedient of economy, but a principle of action on which depend, in a measure, the dignity and usefulness of their noble profession. But, as it is, people will generally sympathize with Dr. Brinkerhoff against the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and will be apt to believe that the practitioner who keeps himself before the public by means of simple and modest advertisements in newspapers or otherwise, is more likely to attain success in his profession than his more rigorously conventional brother who would rather starve in obeying the code than to be rich by conning it.

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER, April 11, '90, [Editorial]: *Doctors and Newspapers.*—The antiquated, moss-covered delusion in medical circles that advertising (paid for) is undignified, is slowly but surely getting its death blow. The younger and more progressive element among medical practitioners are evidently arriving at the conclusion that while the circulation of a live newspaper is not, perhaps, as much in their line as the circulation of the blood, it is a very good thing and comes quite handily in their business. That there is a disposition on the part of many regular physicians of high standing to combat the ironclad rule against the use of printer's ink, Chicago is just now furnishing ample proof. The following editorial, referring to a physician well known to the people of Cleveland and all parts of Ohio appears recently in the *Chicago Tribune*: (See *Chicago Tribune* editorial, page 11) The *Pain Dealer* endorses every word of the above and is pleased to note that the leading newspapers in different parts of the country are devoting much space to the good missionaries work of showing up the absurdity of the advertising clause of the medical code of ethics. This clause which prevents the graduates of the "regular" schools of medicine from informing the public of any particular ability they may possess in the treatment of human ills, is decidedly too unprogressive for a class of men who have made such grand progress during the past half century. And when so successful a practitioner as Dr. Brinkerhoff is dropped from a medical association simply and only because he has seen fit to tell the public, through the medium of a newspaper that he has devoted himself to the special study of certain ailments and offers his service to the treatment of those ills, when this thing comes to pass, intelligent persons need not be amazed if they pause to wonder if this is really the year 1890. In last Tuesday's *Tribune* Dr. Brinkerhoff defends himself in a communication that is so directly to the point that we produce it below: (See *Defense of Medical Advertising*, page 11.)

CLEVELAND LEADER AND HERALD, April 7, '90, [Editorial]: A prominent medical college of Chicago goes just deep down confessably and reputably physician from the rolls of its annual association merely because he persists in advertising his business. It is a reproach to the medical profession that such a thing as this can happen in a progressive American city like Chicago and the time can not be very far distant when nothing of the kind will be known anywhere. We have no sympathy with quacks who risk the lives of their patients in their ignorant and unscrupulous practice and do much to degrade the medical profession, but there is no sound reason why an able and well qualified physician should be any the less trustworthy because he seeks to increase his business by honest advertising.

TOLEDO (Ohio) BLADE [Editorial]: To those who watch the current of human life, there are some things which are as strange as they are inexplicable. For instance, there is the thing known as "advertising." The good doctors who deny each other the right to announce their wisdom in the columns of the newspapers, are never aggrieved if the same purveyor of news mentions certain deeds of theirs with commendation. Thus, let a doctor cut off some one's leg with unexpected *sabotage*, and the chances are that the doctor will fall over himself in his haste to get a mention of it in the daily paper. But let him announce in larger type than caps that he is a winner when ever he tackles measles, and the entire association falls on him tooth and nail and makes life a burden to him. Then, again, on the other hand, let some young doctor of whom no one has heard, and to whom a favorable word in the paper would be of benefit, undertake to secure the insertion of such, and down come the advertising rates on him like the locusts came on the Egyptians of old. On this principle we wait until our friends are dead before we say they are good fellows, and the man who would be benefited by a kind word (this is the essence of advertising) is the very man, of all men, who does not get it.

THE ASHLAND (Ohio) GAZETTE, April 11th, '90, [Editorial]: Dr. W. C. Brinkerhoff, formerly of Upper Sandusky, now of Chicago, and favorably known to a large class of people in this city, was expelled from the College of Physicians and Surgeons because he advertised his business. We can not see why any reputable physician or specialist should not advertise his business just as well as any firm dealing in merchandise. There are quacks in the medical profession as well as in all other professions, but this certainly does not operate against those who are well qualified in the calling which they have chosen. Because one man, or a half dozen men, engaged in selling dry goods or groceries prove dishonest or unworthy of public patronage, is no reason a class should engage in wholesale denunciation of all those who engage in these particular lines of business. Why, then, should the medical fraternity look with disfavor upon the man who inserts a legitimate announcement of what he can do, and what he *does* do? Surely we believe the day is not far distant when such petty grievances will find no place in the mind of the intelligent practitioner.

GALION (O.) INQUIRER, April 4, 1890, [Editorial]: The alumni of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Chicago, has expelled Dr. W. C. Brinkerhoff from the Alumnae Association, because he violates a silly and antiquated code of ethics by advertising his specialty in the newspapers. Dr. Brinkerhoff is a specialist of wide renown, and a veritable humanitarian, and the *ostentatious* conduct of the old fogies in the association is to be deprecated. They had better go take some of their own physic and get some of the bile off their sour stomachs. The idea of dropping a member because he advertises in the newspapers to let the suffering public know that he can cure piles, fistulae, etc., is preposterous, barbarous and worthy only of minds diseased by a prejudice which a rapidly moving world and progressive thought should have eliminated long ago. Let Dr. Brinkerhoff pursue the even tenor of his way, the newspapers and the general public, who believe in progression, are with him, and demand that the old fogies who don't believe in advertising must go. [The editor of the *Galion Inquirer* was treated by the author. He speaks from experience.]

PRINTER'S INK, New York, June 25th, 1890: *Fruits of Advertising.*—Nature at all times and periods of the year places in the hands of man fruits of its evolution. These fruits are the necessities of man's existence; but do we live only to exist? Existence seems to be the only aim of many, but there are others whose ambition is higher. The channels in which that ambition is manifested are many. Commercial and professional channels are the two chief means through which men of ambition ascend the ladder of prosperity. The heart of the commercial world which propels its stream of men so irresistibly on to fortune and success—which is really the fountain of a commercial life—is knifed and torn asunder by the professional world. While it beats and nourishes the commercial body, it is not allowed even an abiding place in the body of professional existence. I refer to advertising. The man of commercial life who enters the stream of business activity, looks first to the press as his medium of success. Through it he attains prosperity. Printer's ink is to his commercial existence as blood is to his physical existence. Why should it not be so? "The pen is mightier than the sword," and the press supplants them both. The heart of the commercial world (advertising) has made a Barnum, a Wanamaker, a Stewart, a Marshall Field, a Rockefeler, an Armour, a Carnegie; and the charitable deeds where by these men alone have distributed millions of dollars among the poor has endeared their names to many an unfortunate. Advertising has enabled them not only to do this, but their respective businesses, nourished by the great advertising heart, affords support to thousands of people. There is a wider scope to advertising than merely the financial benefit to the advertiser and the advertising medium. It is more than the heart of the commercial world. Its fruits are distributed to the ends of the earth. It is the foundation and provider of charity and benevolence. Yet two great professions (medical and legal) regard it "a principle held sacred" not to recognize advertising or the advertisers, if they are members of either of the professions. I refer particularly to the medical profession. The cry of the medical profession when one of its members advertises is, "quack, fraud, imposter." It matters not how prominent, skillful or successful professionally he may be; how much respected and honored by his fellow citizens, and how prominent in society, or scrupulous in business transactions, if he advertises upon his head the maledictions and unjust charges of fraud by the members of the regular profession. A case in point occurred recently in Chicago. The Mutual Medical Aid Association was organized, with Carter Harrison (ex-Mayor of Chicago) as president; Dr. S. K. Crawford, Professor of Surgery, College of P. and S., and Dr. DeWolf, health officer of the city for years, as medical directors. The object of the association was to provide medical treatment for the poorer class of people gratuitously, outside of membership fees of from \$2.00 to \$5.00 per quarter. Its object was praise-worthy, commendable, almost charitable, and worthy the commendation of any American citizen. The association ventured to set forth its object and plan in circular form. For such action (saying to the poor that they would furnish them medical attendance at a rate within their means) Drs. Crawford and DeWolf were summoned before the Chicago Medical Society, and the accusations made there by certain members against them were shameful, such as accusing them of being the instigators of one of the greatest frauds of Chicago, etc. Espe-

cially was it shameful when it is considered that there is no flaw in either of these prominent M. Ds. as regards character or professional ability. How long will this tyranny be exercised in America, the country that offered to our Puritan fathers the liberty of freedom in thought and speech? The fruits of commercial advertising are obvious and plain to be seen. Medical advertising is none the less fruitful; to the contrary, it embraces all that commercial advertising yields, and in addition calls the attention of suffering humanity to those who successfully treat special diseases. It is thus the means of relieving the suffering of our fellow men. The question will doubtless arise in the reader's mind, why should an "advertising specialist" be more successful than a general practitioner? Our answer follows: The specialist confines his practice to one particular line; the general practitioner endeavors to cover the entire field of medicine. Can he do it? I have seen a hoary-headed M. D., after fifty years of practice, shake his head and say, referring to his practice, "I've lived a life of guessing; I'm guessing now, and I'll doubtless die a-guessing." The specialist, being confined in his practice to only one portion of the great study of medicine and surgery, becomes more proficient. He treats more cases in his special line in a month than the general practitioner will in a year. If he advertises judiciously, he will at least double his practice. He gains more experience, which is our best teacher. "It is better to be a master of one trade than a jack of all trades." Yet the "regular general practitioner" would have people believe that the "advertising specialist" knows nothing, while in fact he has fifty chances to learn (in his specialty) where the "regular" general practitioner has but one.

W. C. BRINKERHOFF, M.D.

THE CHICAGO TIMES, May 21, 1890, [Editorial]: *A Prescription for Them.*—The organized medical profession in Chicago is deeply concerned lest one of its members should advertise their calling. They are incidentally agitated if one or more of their number, out of interest for the ailing, and consideration for himself or themselves, should propose a departure from the ordinary charge made for professional service. Certain persons, among them physicians of repute, having devised a medical aid association proposing to furnish medical attendance of the best kind, when needed, to all members of the association for \$12 a year, the M. Ds. of the Chicago society not in the plan made a dreadful bother about it. It was nothing to them that membership of this association was to be confined to wage-workers of limited means who might find the arrangement one of positive advantage. The doctors described it as soliciting patronage by objectional advertising, and of attempting to cheapen professional service by selling it in job lots. They wouldn't tolerate so beneficent, humane and practical a plan, and pronounced their anathema upon it. All men engaged in business or a profession are dependent in greater or less degree upon advertisement, no matter what form it takes. The public is able to discern whether or not the advertisement is meretricious. The doctor who throws out his sign advertises to that extent. So does the lawyer. Each is glad of mention in the press calculated to advance his employment or to conduce thereto. One must make a stir in the world or go to the wall. If he has pots or kettles or professional service to sell, the fact must be made known in some way. The means ought to be a matter of individual judgment or preference. The Times is willing to believe that physicians, as a rule, are mindful in their charges of the pecuniary ability of their patients, and that no one suffering bodily ailments lacks the relief a leech may give merely because of inability to pay, but formally to disconvene a plan which is unobjectionable in itself and may be of great advantage to a body of wage-workers, upon the score that something or another in the musty ethics of the profession having a very mercenary suggestion may be quoted aganst it is to oppose social methods. When upon no better grounds than are named they frown upon such a project as the Mutual Medical Aid Association of Chicago, the doctors of this city who are associated in a medical society seem to stand in need of a drastic dose of common sense.

TOLEDO (Ohio) EVENING BEE, April 23, 1890: *Medical Ethics. Old Foggy Notions Must Give Way to Common Sense and Business Methods.*—No other profession is so bound up in ethical requirements as the gentlemen who practice medicine. They have been in the non-advertising rut so long that they find it very hard to get out, but there are signs of progress on their part. Some of the best physicians and surgeons in the country have grown restive under the nonsensical rule of ethics, and many are now advertising their claims to patronage. The threat of expulsion has kept many in line, but even that penalty has no terror to some. One of the most prominent cases that have come under public observation is that of Dr. W. C. Brinkerhoff, of Chicago, formerly of Upper Sandusky, this state. His father, Dr. A. W. Brinkerhoff, was a celebrated physician and surgeon, and the son is a graduate of a regular college. He is an advertiser, and for that ethical offense has been expelled from the Chicago College of Physicians and Surgeons. The fight he made in the courts of Illinois is remarkable, and so signal was his victory that the state board of health was obliged to pay him \$1000 damages for refusing to license him to practice in the state.

THE REGISTER, Rockford, Ill., April 10th, 1890: Dr. Brinkerhoff, a Chicago physician who advertises in The Register, and whose skill in certain specialties has brought him some patients from Rockford, has been dropped by the Chicago College of Physicians and Surgeons for the crime of advertising. His professional learning and skill are not called in question and seem to be conceded, but his associates don't think it proper that he should accelerate public knowledge of that fact. He is well spoken of by Rockford people who have tested his skill.

IS A PHYSICIAN JUSTIFIED IN ADVERTISING?

Dr. O. M. Vaughan, in *Covert Med. News*, says: The question whether a physician is justified in advertising is one that is being discussed more and more every year. A generation ago the code of ethics was adhered to by physicians in the city as well as in the country, but at the present time the musty code seems to be retained for the purpose of impregnating students and country practitioners with the idea that to advertise is the greatest professional crime in the medical calendar. We say the code seems to be retained principally for the country practitioner because it is almost impossible to find an energetic and progressive city practitioner but who is connected with some medical school, polyclinic, hospital, public or private dispensary, bathing

establishment, or some one or more of the many institutions, the majority of which, so far as one can learn, apparently exist for the sole purpose of booming the interested doctor.

This mode of advertising is sanctioned by the code. Another form of advertising that is sanctioned by our ancient code has recently become popular, and like the above is confined almost ent rely to physicians residing in our large cities. We have received during the past year or two many cards and circulars from city physicians, calling attention to the fact that they would in the future confine their practice to diseases of women; to eye, ear, nose and throat; to nervous diseases, etc., etc. The most modest of these circulars informs the reader that the doctor has all of the most approved apparatus for treating successfully the diseases to which he confines his practice, while many of them state in language intended for the public, that by years of extensive practice in his line the doctor is qualified to treat successfully cases not usually be nefited by ordinary treatment.

The above methods of advertising are only two of several that might be mentioned that are allowed by the code. Let a physician place the same matter in a daily paper, that he mails to physicians and to the public in circular form, and notice how quick a part of the profession will commence to kick, and it will also be noticed that the kickers are most always engaged in booming themselves in some manner. So long as a part of the profession are allowed to advertise we see no reason why all should not have the same privilege. If a physician is more skillful than his neighbors it would appear rational to any level-headed person that he was doing himself an injustice should he neglect to inform the people of his skill; provided he did not advertise to do more than he could. It would also appear advisable to reach the greatest number of people with the least expense, and the doctor who advertises in the daily or weekly paper does so at much less cost than by the methods usually adopted. To incorporate a company, hire a room, get out necessary circulars, etc., to start a polyclinic, or some other of the many institutions that have sprung up within the past four or five years, requires quite a sum of money, and the method of advertising by professional circulars is also quite expensive. Aside from the few institutions that are started and conducted for educational purposes, the elaborate and expensive methods of advertising are adopted, not from any high moral principle, but to simply keep within the rules prescribed by our ancient code. The physician who booms himself in some institution is no more honorable than a man who places a modest advertisement in a daily paper. No code is required to teach an honorable man professional courtesy, and a dishonorable man will not be governed in the least by any code. We believe the time is fast coming when all progressive physicians will feel at liberty to advertise as freely as men engaged in other business, and there is no reason why they should not do so except the restrictions laid down in an ancient code that not one doctor in ten has ever read, but of which the average physician stands in mortal terror.

THE BRINKERHOFF SYSTEM OF Rectal Treatment

HAS BEEN IN USE TEN YEARS, AND WE ARE CONTINUALLY SHIPPING INSTRUMENTS AND REMEDIES TO ALL PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Physicians who are interested in the successful treatment of Rectal Diseases would do well to write for price list, terms, etc., to

W. C. BRINKERHOFF, M.D.,

80 Madison St., Chicago, Ill.

The following letter contains the opinions of Drs. Miller & Jamison, of New York, after nine years use of the system :

DR. W. C. BRINKERHOFF,
39, 39½ & 40, McVicker's Bldg.,
78 to 82 Madison St., Chicago, Ill:

39 & 41 WEST 26TH STREET,

NEW YORK, Jan. 24, 1890.

MY DEAR SIR:—In reply to your inquiries of January 15th, we would say that we have been using the Brinkerhoff System of Treatment for Diseases of the Rectum in our practice in this city about nine years. We do not fail to cure every case of hemorrhoids that we have had to treat, when directions are followed, and we believe that for such maladies it is an infallible remedy. For ulcerations, inflammation, fistula, etc., the results are excellent, and far superior to any treatment known to the medical profession. It is a system of treatment that ought to be in the hands of every physician in the United States. We have cured cases of hemorrhoids of forty to fifty years' standing (that were supposed to be incurable by any system of treatment) leaving the rectum in apparently as healthy a condition as it ever was. We are constantly treating cases that have been cut, ligatured, chloroformed and tortured, without being cured, and they get well under The Brinkerhoff Treatment. You can hardly say too much in its praise.

Very respectfully yours,

DRS. MILLER & JAMISON.

Editorial from THE AMERICAN LANCET, a
leading Medical Journal, published
at Detroit, Mich.

THE MEANING OF THE TERM "QUACK."

November, 1890.

IN general, the word quack is a term of reproach applied to medical men, its application usually being restricted to those who, in one way or another, advertise the accomplishment of large or impossible results. Loosely, also, it has been applied to even more important persons in the profession. In general, the regular is inclined to think of the homœopath, the eclectic, the "Christian Scientist," mind and faith-cure practitioners, etc., as quacks. In turn, these separate classes return the compliment. It is thus never a term of endearment or high appreciation of either manly or professional qualities. *It is not denied that a quack may be perfectly competent*, but it is affirmed that with or without this he has that peculiar obliquity that sacrifices truth in order to gain the attention and patronage of the afflicted.

However, we mainly desire to direct attention to the fact that we are likely to obtain a judicial decision of the meaning of the term. Two regular physicians of Buffalo had a disagreement over a case of hernia, as a result of which one called the other, in the presence of the county medical society, a "notorious quack." For this defamation the injured physician seeks through the courts the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars; also large damages from the Buffalo *Medical Journal* for publishing the official report of the Secretary. It will be interesting to learn if the courts hold the *Journal* responsible for publishing an official report of a regular medical society. One thing is peculiar in the matter. The person seeking damages called the defendant in consultation. The latter, by his speech in the county society, is clearly guilty of consulting with one whom he calls a quack. What will the society do about this infringement of ordinary professional relations? To consult with quacks has never been regarded as the mark of a high-minded medical gentleman; but having consulted with one, it seems to us it had been far better to have avoided the defiling of his own reputation, and kept his thoughts to himself. It was competent for him to discuss the value of electricity in treating hernia without involving any personalities. It looks bad for a consultant to revile the doctor who calls him in consultation. If the person calling him was a notorious quack, it would seem that the wise course would have been to have refused consultation; at all events, such is the advice of the Code of Ethics, formulated by the profession, and regarded as a safe guide by large numbers of medical gentlemen.